

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed June 28, 2005 (the "Office Action"). At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-30 were pending in the Application. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-30. Claims 1-30 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 12-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,178,511 issued to Cohen et al. ("*Cohen*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,609,198 issued to Wood et al. ("*Wood*"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for the reasons stated below.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974). Applicant respectfully submits that each and every element of Claims 12-16 is not found within the references cited by the Examiner.

Claim 12, as amended, recites:

A method for accessing a plurality of resources having different authorization requirements, comprising:
 accessing, via an electronic device, a network comprising a plurality of resources;
 providing identifying data to said network;
 retrieving, in response to the identifying data, a unique universal user identifier corresponding to said user from a repository of unique universal user identifiers;
 storing said unique universal user identifier on a storage device, said unique universal user identifier indicating said user is authenticated; and
 accessing one of said plurality of resources, wherein said unique universal user identifier is transmitted to said one of said plurality of resources to identify said user such that said user can access authorized resources without providing additional identifying information and said user is denied access to unauthorized resources.

Applicant respectfully submits that the *Cohen-Wood* combination suggested by the Examiner fails to teach, suggest, or disclose each of these elements. For example, the references cited by the Examiner fail to teach, suggest, or disclose "retrieving, in response to

the identifying data, a unique universal user identifier corresponding to said user from a repository of unique universal user identifiers.” Instead, *Wood* discloses associated a unique session identifier with a set of access requests originating from a client entity and maintaining the unique session identifier across a credential level change.” Col. 3, ll. 4-6 (emphasis added). A session identifier, however, is not a unique universal user identifier. As defined by *Wood*, a session is a “period and collection of states spanning one or more interactions between an entity [e.g., user] and an information environment.” Col. 5, ll. 25-36; see also col. 5, ll. 15-24. Since this definition distinguishes between a user and a session, the two cannot be analogous. Because of this, *Wood*’s session identifier also cannot be a unique universal user identifier. Therefore, for at least this reason, *Wood* fails to teach, suggest, or disclose a unique universal user identifier as recited in Claim 12.

Even assuming *Wood* does disclose a unique universal user identifier as recited in Claim 12, the references cited by the Examiner still fail to teach, suggest, or disclose that the identifier is retrieved “from a repository of unique universal user identifiers.” Nothing in *Wood* teaches, suggests, or discloses such a repository. Instead, *Wood* discloses that a login component supplies a session token using a set cookie directive encoded with the results streamed back from an information resource in response to an access request. Col. 13, ll. 27-44. As such, the session token is dynamically created, and is not retrieved from a repository of unique universal user identifiers. Therefore, for at least these reasons, *Wood* fails to teach, suggest, or disclose “retrieving, in response to the identifying data, a unique universal user identifier corresponding to said user from a repository of unique universal user identifiers” as required by Claim 12. As such, Applicant submits that the rejection of Claim 12 is improper, and respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 12 be withdrawn.

Claims 13-16 each depend, directly or indirectly, from Claim 12. Therefore, Applicant submits that Claims 13-16 are also allowable, for example, for reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to Claim 12, and respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 13-16 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-11 and 17-30 were rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Cohen* in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0161901 for Weissman (“*Weissman*”) and also in view of *Wood*. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reasons stated below.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A method for authenticating and authorizing a user of an electronic device in communication with a network, comprising:

receiving a user request from a user of an electronic device in communication with a network;

searching for information relating to said user in a repository of user information, said searching based at least partially on said user request and a login identity supplied by said user;

retrieving, from the repository of user information, a unique universal user identifier representing said user upon locating said information of said user;

storing at least said unique universal user identifier in a data packet;

sending said data packet to a storage device such that said data packet is transmittable to electronic devices in communication with said network when said user attempts to access a resource within said network; and

retrieving an authorization datum associated with said user, based at least partially on said unique universal user identifier, from said resource.

Applicants submit that the *Cohen-Weissman-Wood* combination suggested by the Examiner fails to teach, suggest, or disclose each of these elements. For example, the references cited by the Examiner fail to teach, suggest, or disclose “retrieving, from the repository of user information, a unique universal user identifier representing said user upon locating said information of said user.” As discussed above with regard to Claim 12, the *Wood* reference relied upon by the Examiner fails to teach, suggest, or disclose retrieving a unique universal user identifier from such a repository. Therefore, Applicant submits that the rejection of Claim 1 is improper, and respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 18, 23, and 28 also recite limitations similar to those discussed above with regard to Claims 1. For example, Claim 18 recites “accessing a repository containing a plurality of unique universal user identifiers” and “retrieving one of said unique universal user identifiers from said repository.” Claim 23 recites “a repository containing a plurality of unique universal user identifiers, each unique universal user identifier being unique to a user” and “a first software tool suitable for . . . accessing said repository [and] locating a unique universal user identifier relating to said user.” Claim 28 recites “locating said user credential

in said authentication database” and “retrieving a unique universal user identifier representing said user upon locating said user credential.” Therefore, Applicant submits that Claims 18, 23, and 28 are also allowable so reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to Claim 1, and respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 18, 23, and 28 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-11, 17, 19-22, 24-27, and 29-30 each depend, directly or indirectly, from Claims 1, 12, 18, 23, and 28. Therefore, Applicant submits that Claims 2-11, 17, 19-22, 24-27, and 29-30 are also allowable, for example, for reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to Claims 1, 12, 18, 23, and 28. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 2-11, 17, 19-22, 24-27, and 29-30 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other apparent reasons, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all pending Claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicant stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner. Applicant believes no fee is due. However, should there be a fee discrepancy, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Thomas J. Frame
Reg. No. 47,232
Phone: (214) 953-6675

Date: September 20, 2005

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer Number: **05073**
Attorney Docket No.: 063170.6963